

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---------------|----------------------|------------------------|------------------|
| 10/621,317 | 07/18/2003 | Ashvin D. Desai | 87344.1524 | 2539 |
| 75 | 90 08/24/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| Baker & Hostetler LLP | | | SAVAGE, MATTHEW O | |
| Washington Square, Suite 1100 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| Washington, D | | | 1724 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 08/24/200 | 5 |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| • | | | is v |
|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| · | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| Advisory Action | 10/621,317 DESAI ET AL. | | |
| Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Matthew O. Savage | 1724 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication ap | pears on the cover sheet w | ith the correspondence addi | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>15 August 2005</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS | S APPLICATION IN CONDITI | ON FOR ALLOWANCE. | • |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to of this application, applicant must timely file one of the for places the application in condition for allowance, (2) a (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in confollowing time periods: The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date | ollowing replies: (1) an amend Notice of Appeal (with appea npliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | lment, affidavit, or other evide al fee) in compliance with 37 C | ence, which CFR 41.31; or |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later | Advisory Action, or (2) the date set | | r is later. In no |
| Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.0 | (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHE | | OWT NIHTIW C |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three more armed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | on and the corresponding amount of statutory period for reply originally | f the fee. The appropriate extensio set in the final Office action; or (2) | n fee under 37 as set forth in (b) |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in co | ompliance with 37 CFR 41.37 | must be filed within two month | ths of the date |
| of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any | | | |
| Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply mus | st be filed within the time per | od set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a | a). |
| AMENDMENTS | | | |
| 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE b) | consideration and/or search | | pecause |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in appeal; and/or | better form for appeal by ma | | the issues for |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling | • • | finally rejected claims. | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR | | (1) 0 1: 14 | (DTOL 004) |
| 1. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR | | r Non-Compliant Amendment | (PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection3. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be | | senarate timely filed amendm | ent canceling |
| the non-allowable claim(s). | e allowable il Subifilited ili a | separate, timery filed amendin | ent cancering |
| 7. Tor purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proposed amendment(s). The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: | | b) ☐ will be entered and an | explanation of |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-6</u> . | • | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | . h.,,,, h.,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | filing a Nation of Annual | not be entered |
| The affidavitor other evidence filed after a final action because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | and sufficient reasons why t | he affidavit or other evidence | is necessary |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of fil entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is neces | to overcome <u>all</u> rejections un | der appeal and/or appellant fa | ils to provide a |

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _ AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

9.

The affidavit or other evidence filed after the d entered because the affidavit or other evidence showing a good and sufficient reasons why it i

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. A The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

| 2. 🔲 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | |
|---|--|
|---|--|

12 13. Other: _

> Matthew O Savage Primary Examiner

Art Unit: 1724

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The combination of claim 1 with claims 2-3, none of which are allowable, fails to materially reduce or similify the issues for appeal. The replacement of "disposed within" with --defined by-- in claims 1 and 4 raises the issue of new matter. The new combination of elements recited in proposed new claim 7 raises new issues requiring more than nominal consideration and fails to material reduce or simplify the issues for appeal.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Elliott fails to disclose a housing having inlet and outlet ports and a first strainer chamber, first and second valve chambers, and a detachable second strainer chamber, however, it is held that Elliott clearly discloses a housing (e.g., the left half of the shell 2 shown in FIG. 3) having inlet and outlet ports 4, 5, a first strainer chamber (e.g., holding strainer 31), and first and second valve chambers (e.g., holding first and second valves 9, 10), and a detachable second strainer chamber (e.g., the right half of the shell 2). With respect to applicant's request for clarification of the rejections of claim 6, it is noted that separate grounds of rejection are applied to claim 6 in order to cover the functional limitation of simultaneous flow through the first and second strainer chambers.